

REMARKS

In the July 17, 2008 Office Action, claims 1-51 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claim 5 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claims 1-30, 35, 38-40, 44-46 were rejected as being indefinite. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the July 17, 2008 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1-51 as indicated above. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter of claim 5 and the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-51 are pending, with claims 1-3, 31, and 38 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

In items 1-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-30, 35, 38-40, and 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1-30, 35, 38-40, and 44-46 to clarify. Especially, claims 1-3 have been amended to recite "that provides to the used device the content." Claims 14 has been amended to depend from claim 13. Claim 15 has been amended to recite Customer Relationship Management.

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-30, 23, 28-40, and 44-46 are now correct. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In item 7 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 6-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004-0255034 (Choi). In

response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1-3, 31, and 38 to clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record.

In particular, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite that a user device is configured to capture the code value, that a communication entity platform is configured to receive a code value from outside to provide the content information corresponding to the code, and record an interested party-related log that provides the user device the content, that an operating agent platform is configured to receive the code value from the user device and distribute the code value to the communication entity platform, that an on-line interested party module is configured to register resource corresponding to the content in the communication entity platform and provide the content to the user device, and that an off-line interested party module is configured to receive the code value, which is issued by the operating agent platform, and insert the code value after being issued into an off-line medium in order to let a user select information to be associated with the code value.

Choi was cited in the Office Action to show a communication entity platform, an operating agent platform, and on-line interested party module, and an off-line interested party module. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Choi is different because, as stated in the Office Action, Choi's pattern is merely a customer identifier but not a code captured by a user device that eventually results in provision of a content. Namely, Applicants respectfully assert that Choi does not disclose providing a content based on the pattern.

Clearly, Applicants respectfully assert that this arrangement is *not* disclosed or suggested by Choi or any other prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as

now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As claims 2, 3, 31, and 38 similarly recites, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, 3, 31, and 38 are also allowable for the same or similar reasons stated above.

Moreover, Applicants believe that dependent claims 4, 6-31, 33-38, and 40-51 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, 2, 3, 31, or 38, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, dependent claims 4, 6-31, 33-38, 40-51 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 1-3, 31, and 38, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

In item 8 of the Office Action, claim 5 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application.

Appl. No. 10/539,556
Amendment dated January 15, 2009
Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2008

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-51 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Akiyoshi Onda /
Akiyoshi Onda
Limited Recognition No. L0339

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: January 15, 2009

S:\2008\12-DEC08-AO\GK-US055148 Amendment.doc